

Exhibit 8

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE: INSULIN PRICING LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

The State of Texas v. Eli Lilly and Company, et al., Case No. 2:24-cv-10854

Case No. 2:23-md-03080

MDL No. 3080

JUDGE BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI

JUDGE RUKHSANAH L. SINGH

**STATE OF TEXAS OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
CONSUMER PROTECTION DIVISION**

**SUPPLEMENTAL
DAO SUBMISSION PURSUANT TO CMO #15**

Departments, Agencies or Offices Information

The State of Texas Office of the Attorney General, Consumer Protection Division (“TX CPD” or “plaintiff”) hereby supplements its initial identification of the Departments, Agencies or Offices (“DAO”) that possess information or documents responsive to the Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“PFS”) and whether such will be provided in the PFS response without the need for a Court order or subpoena.

In this supplement, Plaintiff sets forth its position on additional DAO identified by Defendants. Plaintiff does not agree or concede that any of these non-party additional DAO, each of which is an independent state agency, are necessary or relevant to the instant litigation.

<u>Initial Departments</u>	<u>Defendant Subpoena Needed</u>
Attorney General’s Office (“AGO”)	No
Health and Human Services Commission (HHS) (State Health Plan) ¹	Yes
Comprehensive Health	Yes

¹ The State of Texas has not asserted claims on behalf of the Texas State Employee Health Plan, does not represent the State Employee Health Plan and does not concede that the State Employee Health plan is relevant to the instant proceedings. Texas was not transferred into this MDL until January 2, 2024 and was not a party to the briefings leading to Judge Singh’s November 22, 2024 Ruling (Dkt. No. 655). Texas is prepared to meet and confer promptly with Defendants regarding its responses herein.

Insurance Plan (CHIP)(Medicaid) ²	
--	--

<u>Additional DAO</u>	<u>Defendant Subpoena Needed</u>
Texas Department of Criminal Justice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctional Managed Health Care Committee 	Yes
Texas Juvenile Justice Department	Yes
Texas Health and Human Services Commission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan (CHIP) (Medicaid) • Office of Inspector General 	Yes
Texas State Board of Pharmacy	Yes
Texas Department of Insurance	Yes
Texas State Auditor's Office	Yes
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts	Yes
Teacher Retirement System of Texas	Yes
Texas Employee Retirement System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HealthSelect of Texas 	Yes
Texas Emergency Services Retirement System	Yes
University of Texas Medical Branch	Yes

² The State of Texas has not asserted claims on behalf of State Medicaid and does not concede that Medicaid is relevant to the instant proceedings. The State of Texas lists Medicaid Department in this document only because PFS questions 31 and 46 required information in the Medicaid Department's possession, custody and control. Defendants now seek broader responses from Medicaid, to which the TX CPD does not agree.

For those Departments, Agencies or Offices that possess responsive information or documents and for whom a subpoena is needed, the State of Texas responds to the following questions:

(a) Basis for not providing such discovery

All of the additional DAO are independent agencies not represented by the Texas Attorney General Consumer Protection Division in this proceeding and not under its control. Nor are any a party to the instant proceeding.

(b) Whether plaintiffs or its attorneys will be representing that entity if Defendants were to issue a R. 45 subpoena

Plaintiff and its counsel will cooperate and work collaboratively with counsel for any Texas agencies who receive a R.45 subpoena from defendants in this matter.

(c) Whether Plaintiff will claim privilege between Plaintiff or its attorneys or that entity

Plaintiff will claim all appropriate privileges including work product, common interest, and deliberative process with any Texas agency to whom defendants issue a R.45 subpoena. At this stage, plaintiff would not expect to claim an attorney-client privilege with the additional DAO should Defendants issue R.45 subpoenas to them.

(d) Whether Plaintiff or its attorneys issues a legal hold notice to that entity.

The Texas AGO has no jurisdiction to issue a litigation hold to the additional DAO.

Dated: March 6, 2025

By: /s/ Joanne Cicala
Joanne Cicala
The Cicala Law Firm PLLC
101 College Street
Dripping Springs, Texas 78620
Tel. (512) 275-6550
Fax: (512) 858-1801
joanne@cicalapllc.com

Walter G. Watkins, III
Tanya D. Ellis
Forman Watkins & Krutz LLP
210 E. Capitol Street, Suite 2200
Jackson, Mississippi 39201-2375
Tel: (601) 960-8600
Fax: (601) 960-8613

Trey.watkins@formanwatkins.com

William Liston
W. Lawrence Deas
Liston & Deas, PLLC
605 Crescent Blvd., Suite 200
Ridgeland, Mississippi 39157
Tel: (601) 981-1636
Fax: (601) 982-0371
lawrence@listondeas.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 6, 2025 I emailed the foregoing to Ext-MDL-Insulin-AG-JDG@Kirkland.com as required by CMO #15.

s/ Joanne Cicala
Joanne Cicala